

3. Do you find that LPL has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the method CPT uses to manufacture its LCD modules using both inner and outer guard rings literally infringes Claim 1 or Claim 8 of the '002 patent? Answer "yes" or "no" for each claim listed below.

	Yes (infringe)	No (do not infringe)
Claim 1	_____	<u>✓</u> _____
Claim 8	_____	<u>✓</u> _____

4. Do you find that LPL has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the method CPT uses to manufacture its LCD modules using both inner and outer guard rings infringes Claim 1 or Claim 8 of the '002 patent under the doctrine of equivalents?

	Yes (infringe)	No (do not infringe)
Claim 1	<u>✓</u> _____	_____
Claim 8	<u>✓</u> _____	_____

If you have answered "yes" to any of questions 1 through 4, proceed to question 5. Otherwise, skip questions 5 through 9 and proceed to question 10. For questions 5 through 8, an "infringing product" is one that is made by a method patented in the United States.

5. A. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that CPT has used, sold, or offered for sale in the United States, or imported into the United States, any infringing CPT LCD product or any completed LCD display that contains an infringing CPT LCD product?

Yes ✓_____ No _____

B. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that CPT has actively induced anyone to use, sell, or offer for sale in the United States, or to import into the United States, any infringing CPT LCD product or any completed LCD display that contains an infringing CPT LCD product?

Yes ✓_____ No _____

6. A. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Tatung Company has used, sold, or offered for sale in the United States, or imported into the United States, any infringing CPT LCD product or any completed LCD display that contains an infringing CPT LCD product?

Yes ✓ No

B. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Tatung Company has actively induced anyone to use, sell, or offer for sale in the United States, or to import into the United States, any infringing CPT LCD product or any completed LCD display that contains an infringing CPT LCD product?

Yes ✓ No

7. A. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Tatung Company of America has used, sold, or offered for sale in the United States, or imported into the United States, any infringing CPT LCD product or any completed LCD display that contains an infringing CPT LCD product?

Yes ✓ No

B. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Tatung Company of America has actively induced anyone to use, sell, or offer for sale in the United States, or to import into the United States, any infringing CPT LCD product or any completed LCD display that contains an infringing CPT LCD product?

Yes ✓ No

8. A. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that ViewSonic Corporation has used, sold, or offered for sale in the United States, or imported into the United States, any infringing CPT LCD product or any completed LCD display that contains an infringing CPT LCD product?

Yes ✓ No

B. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that ViewSonic Corporation has actively induced anyone to use, sell, or offer for sale in the United States, or to import into the United States, any infringing CPT LCD product or any completed LCD display that contains an infringing CPT LCD product?

Yes ✓ No

If you have answered “yes” to any of questions 5 through 8, then proceed to question 9. Otherwise, skip question 9 and proceed to question 10.

9. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that any Defendant’s infringement of the claims of the ‘002 patent was willful? Answer “yes” or “no” for each Defendant below.

	Yes	No
Chungwha Picture Tubes	<u>✓</u>	<u> </u>
Tatung Company	<u>✓</u>	<u> </u>
Tatung Company of America	<u>✓</u>	<u> </u>
ViewSonic Corporation	<u>✓</u>	<u> </u>

10. Do you find that Defendants have proven by clear and convincing evidence that Claim 1 of the ‘002 patent is invalid by anticipation?

Yes No ✓

11. Do you find that Defendants have proven by clear and convincing evidence that claim 8 of the ‘002 patent is invalid for obviousness?

Yes No ✓

If you have found infringement of a valid claim, then proceed to question 12. Otherwise, your deliberations have ended.

12. On what date do you find that LPL first provided CPT with effective notice that CPT allegedly infringed the '002 patent?

Date: 02-27-02

13. What sum of money would fairly and adequately compensate LPL for infringement?

Answer: \$ 52,477,000.00

Egaleil Mery
Jury Foreperson

Edward P. Hedrick
Juror

Mark E. Johnson
Juror

Beth Lowery
Juror

Cut Bfl
Juror

John A. Miller
Juror

MB Luhn
Juror

W. H. Green
Juror

Dr. Joseph
Juror

Dated: July 27, 2006.